

**REMARKS**

We are enclosing formal drawings to replace the informal ones filed with the application.

Applicants affirm the election of Group I, Species I (Figs. 1 to 8). Along with claims 1 to 6, 8 and 13, 14 and 16, we submit that claims 9 to 12 (as amended) and claim 17 are also directed to the dispenser depicted in Figs. 1 to 8 and belong in the elected group/species.

Claims 9 to 12, dependent upon claim 1, all require a first, liquid formulation and a second, solid formulation. Claim 17, dependent upon allowed claim 16 is also directed to the Figs. 1 to 8 dispenser embodiment. It is explicitly stated on specification page 13, fourth paragraph that the solid formulation, i.e. tablet 50, is kept separate from the liquid formulation from container 6 until they mix in the toilet bowl.

Thus, claim 17 should be allowed along with claim 16.

The above amendments to the specification address the objections noted in the paragraphs 5 to 7 of the action. The specification and claims now conform to 35 U.S.C. 1.112.

Applicants request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1 to 6 and 9 to 14 as being anticipated by Creed or as being unpatentable over Creed in view of Klinkhammer et al or Hammond et al.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the substance of cancelled claims 2, 4 and 9. It now clearly distinguishes the Creed reference. More particularly, claim 1 now specifies a liquid dispensing unit for a toilet bowl which includes a container containing a first, liquid formulation, a cage containing a second, solid formulation, a strap for suspending the dispensing unit from the rim of the toilet bowl, a delivery plate, in use, the liquid being delivered onto the delivery plate whereby flush water washes the liquid formulation into the toilet bowl. Finally, claim 1 specifies means for automatically delivering said formulations to the toilet bowl.

Thus, the claimed invention concerns a device which is mounted on the rim of a toilet bowl and delivers two formulations, namely a solid formulation and a liquid formulation, into the toilet bowl, that is to say, into the water held in the toilet bowl, using the action of the toilet flush water.

The cited Creed reference only delivers one substance into the toilet bowl, i.e. the (dissolved) solid substance. Thus, referring to Figs. 4 and 8 of Creed, the water cascades onto plate 8 and is fed through slot 18 where it contacts solid balls 20 and drains into the bowl through perforations 21; see Pat. page 1, lines 70 - 85.

The liquid formulation in the adjacent compartment 4 is not delivered into the toilet bowl. Rather, that liquid simply evaporates from the container 4 through perforations 8 as fumes to disinfect the air in the space in which the holder is located; see Pat. page 1, lines 86-92 and lines 47-54.

Thus, there is no teaching whatsoever in Creed of a device for delivering two substances simultaneously into the toilet bowl or into the water in the toilet bowl. The cited secondary references also fail in that respect. Accordingly, claim 1 should be allowed as should all of the claims dependent upon claim 1.


New claims 25 to 35 also belong in the elected group/species since they are directed to the Figs. 1 to 8 dispenser embodiment.

Claims 25 to 33 are all dependent upon claim 1 and should be allowed for the same reasons discussed above in connection with claim 1.

New independent claim 34 contains the same limitations as allowed claim 16 plus additional limitations. Therefore, that claim should be allowed for the same reasons as claim 16. New claim 35, being dependent upon claim 34, should also be allowed.

Please charge any additional fee occasioned by this paper to our Deposit Account No. 03-1237.

Respectfully submitted,



John F. McKenna  
Reg. No. 20,912  
CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP  
88 Black Falcon Avenue  
Boston, MA 02210-2414  
(617) 951-2500